# EXHIBIT A to

**Homewood Declaration** 

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197 Tel 213.229.7000 www.gibsondunn.com

Christopher D. Dusseault Direct: +1 213.229.7855 Fax: +1 213.229.6855 CDusseault@gibsondunn.com

Client: 56736-00004

May 6, 2013

## VIA HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Robert E. Payne, United States District Judge United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division Spottswood W. Robinson III and Robert R. Merhige, Jr., Federal Courthouse 701 East Broad Street Richmond, VA 23219

Re: ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc., Civil Action No. 3:09cv620

### Dear Judge Payne:

During post-hearing arguments on April 26, 2013, Your Honor asked Mr. Thomasch whether the contempt hearing record included evidence showing which software configuration particular Lawson Software, Inc. ("Lawson") customers had, and Mr. Thomasch stated that he believed that there was such information in the record, having come in through the remedies case. 4/26/13 Tr. at 29-30. Lawson submits this letter to summarize for the Court's convenience the information in the record on the configurations of particular Lawson customers.

The contempt hearing record contains evidence showing the Lawson customers that had Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5 during the time period from the date of the injunction through November 30, 2012. While the record does not contain a summary list of those customer names, such a summary list can be prepared from the records that are in evidence, and was prepared and agreed to by the parties' respective economic experts. Attached as Exhibit A is a list of 146 customers by name (and with identification numbers and configuration designations) who possess either Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5. This list comprises the customers that each party's economic expert identified using information in Lawson's records. It is our understanding that there is no substantive dispute between the parties as to the identities of the customers who had Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5 as summarized on the attached list.

On Friday, May 3, 2013, Lawson proposed to ePlus that the parties jointly submit this list to your Honor, and further stated that Lawson would submit the list on its own if ePlus did not wish to join. Lawson agreed to wait to send the list to Your Honor until today, to give ePlus

The Honorable Robert E. Payne, United
States District Judge
May 6, 2013
Page 2

time to evaluate whether to join in the submission. On Monday, May 6, 2013, ePlus confirmed that it would not join in the submission of this list even though it simply identifies the same customers included on a summary document that ePlus had proposed to submit to the Court during the hearing,¹ reflects the same customer names as determined by each of the parties' experts, and is information already in evidence but presented in a form more convenient for the Court's use. When the undersigned provided a copy of the list to counsel for ePlus, ePlus's counsel did not express any substantive disagreement with the identification of the 146 customers with Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5. Lastly, Lawson notes that ePlus bears the burden of proving that any challenged conduct pertains to a customer with Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5.

The list was derived from the following documents that have been admitted into evidence: PX-1080 (License Revenue May 23, 2011 – November 30, 2011); PX-1081 (Maintenance Revenue May 23, 2011 – November 30, 2011); PX-1241 (License Revenue December 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012); PX-1242 (Maintenance Revenue December 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012); PX-1246 (License Revenue September 1, 2012 – November 30, 2012); PX-1247 (Maintenance Revenue September 1, 2012 – November 30, 2012); and PX-1078 (SKU Chart). These documents together comprise the license and maintenance data for all United States Lawson customers, for all SKUs (not limited to those that make up Configuration Nos. 3 and 5), from at least the date of the injunction to November 30, 2012, and a SKU description chart. They were moved into evidence by ePlus.

This list of customer names – previously agreed-to by the parties' respective experts – allows easy identification by name of those customers with Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5. The information on the list can be verified from the documents identified above by using the following steps:

- Filter each financial data sheet to gather all data lines corresponding to the
  desired customer (filter by customer name ("Customer Name" column) or
  identification number ("Customer #" column) in each of the above
  revenue spreadsheets);
- Search all resulting spreadsheet data lines for each of the SKUs identified as corresponding to an "infringing" SKU in PX-1078 (referred to by

When ePlus made that proposal during the hearing, Lawson did not agree because the summary document that ePlus proposed to move into evidence contained information about particular customers beyond what is provided on Exhibit A, and Lawson had insufficient time to determine its accuracy.

The Honorable Robert E. Payne, United States District Judge May 6, 2013
Page 3

Dr. Ugone as the "Rosetta Stone," Tr. 882:22-883:9). These SKUs are located in the "SKU" column;

 Determine which modules the customer has based on which SKUs from the PX-1078 chart appear in the data for that customer's name/number.

As an example, to determine whether the "City of Boise" has a configuration at issue, for each spreadsheet, the "Customer Name" column should be filtered for "City of Boise." The SKU column in the resulting lines should then be searched for each of the SKUs identified in PX-1078. If this is performed in all of the spreadsheets, it can be seen that the customer has the following SKUs from PX-1078: LSF (Lawson System Foundation), PFX (Process Flow), FINPRO (Inventory Control/Purchase Order/Requisition + other modules not at issue), RQC (Requisition Center), SIPP (Requisition Center), and EPP (Punchout), but certainly does not have EDI, TCS or HBP (which are all SKUs for Electronic Data Interchange - EDI). Thus, the record evidence indicates that City of Boise is a Configuration No. 3 customer. In contrast, a similar search for Western Lake Superior Sanitary (mentioned at Tr. 24:2-21, 545:4-546:6, 587:6-589:12, and 603:19-605:9) reflects that it has the following SKUs from PX-1078: LSF, PROC (Inventory Control/Purchase Order/Requisition), SIPP, and RQC, but does not have EPP, EPPH (Punchout), EDI, TCS, or HBP meaning that Western Lake Superior Sanitary is neither a Configuration No. 3 nor a Configuration No. 5 customer. Similarly, a search of the referenced exhibits for Art Crandall & Associates, another company mentioned at trial (at Tr. 16:16-18), would yield no results in any of the referenced exhibits, indicating that it was not a Lawson customer at all during this time period.

Performing such an analysis of the evidence for each customer listed in any of the license or maintenance data spreadsheets would generate a list of 72 Configuration No. 3 customers, and 74 Configuration No. 5 customers.<sup>2</sup> For Your Honor's convenience, and so the Court does not need to go through these steps where there is no dispute between the parties as to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Both experts made certain assumptions that impact the categorization of particular customers. For example, both experts assumed that a customer on the original list of 864 RSS/RQC customers from the underlying trial had not only RSS/RQC, but also Inventory Control, Requisition Center, and Purchase Order, regardless of whether revenue for each of those modules was recognized in the data spreadsheets Order, regardless of whether revenue for each of those modules was recognized in the data spreadsheets during the relevant time period. The data spreadsheets provided substantially all of the information needed to determine which customers had which configurations; however, in some cases, Lawson provided additional information that was relied upon by both experts without dispute, and the resulting list in Exhibit A is based upon that information. These assumptions serve to increase, rather than decrease, the number of customers deemed to have Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5. Both experts adopted the list of customers in Exhibit A.

The Honorable Robert E. Payne, United States District Judge May 6, 2013 Page 4

the identity of customers with Configuration No. 3 or Configuration No. 5, Exhibit A summarizes the results of the described process, identifying the set of customers having Configuration Nos. 3 or 5 during the May 23, 2011 – November 30, 2012 period.<sup>3</sup> Without reference to Exhibit A, however, the information about Configuration Nos. 3 and 5 customers may be derived through evidence in the record, as shown above.

) USSON 1/-

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher D. Dusseault

Attachment

cc: Counsel of Record (Via E-mail)

CDD/lsj

It should be noted that the parties' experts used a difference process than the one described here, utilizing sophisticated, computerized data analysis tools. However, the steps described here will yield the same list as produced by the experts' methods.

# **EXHIBIT A**

	Customer ID#	Configuration <sup>[1]</sup>
Name	5040	
[1] ADVOCATE HEALTH CARE NETWORK	72087	5
[2] Affiliated Computer Services	6206	5
[3] ALBERT EINSTEIN HEALTHCARE [4] AQUA - PHILADELPHIA SUBURBAN W	3089	3
	6183	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
550, 5 1 1 2 4 5 3 4 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	306201	3
[6] Assurant Solutions [7] Athens Regional Health Systems Inc.	100011223	August 2.50.4
191 BANNER HEALTH	5575	5 40-8033-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-81-
191 BARBARA'ANN KARMANOS CANCER	6126	3
[10] BAYLOR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM	4614 100008689	and the contract of the second
[11] Bermuda Hospitals Board	72938	3
[12] BEXAR COUNTY	72855	5/5
[13] Billings Clinic Foundation	6184	3
[14] BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO [15] BOSTONMEDICAL CENTER		3.
NAME OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PR	6863	5
[16] Cancer Treatment Centers [17] CARETECH'SOLUTIONS, INC.	5623	3
[18] Carilion Services, Inc.	4737	<b>3</b> ************************************
101 CARPENTERSVILLE CUSD 300	6110	<b>5</b>
1201 CASH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL	2791 5996	CONTRACTOR INCOME.
12:11 CATHOLICHEALTHINITE FINALBI	5727	5
[22] CENTER FOR THE DISABLED	5376	5
[23] GenterLight Health System [24] CENTRAL DUPAGE HOSPITAL	4364	5
	10000628	<b>1</b> // <b></b>
[25] Central Maine Healthcare [26] CENTURA HEALTH	4423	<b>3</b> ************************************
1271 CHEROKEE NATION	6021	3
1281 CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY	6142	3 
1291 CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF	4923 6102	5
[30] CHILDREN'S MEDICAL CENTER	73647	5 1
[3]] GHILDREN'S MERCY HOSPITAL	6525	5
[32] CHRIST HOSPITAL, THE	73602	3
[33] City/Of/Boise [34] City of Lees Summit	73578	3
[34] City of Lees Summit [35] CITY OF LITTLE ROCK AR	6224	, , <b>3</b>
(36) CITY OF TOPEKA	6509	3 3
1371 CLACKAMAS EDUCATION	5466	<b></b>
1381 CLARK MEMORIAL HOSPITAL	73598 4881	o Garago de Aria
1391 GLEVELAND GLINIC FOUNDATION	6570	5
[40] COMMUNITY MEDICAL CENTERS	62.11	<b>76.00 - 5.00</b>
ATT CONSUME VIA DEN'S HEALTH CARE	72116	5
<ul> <li>In the second control of the control o</li></ul>	5815	<b>5</b>
[43] Cooper Health System [44] County of DuPage	10001167	70 3
ניין סטווון ייים יי		

	Customer ID#	Configuration <sup>[1]</sup>
Name	73607	5****
[45] COVENANT/HEALTHCARE MICHIGAN	1778	3
[46] DALLAS AREA RAPID TRANSIT-DART	6233	· 5
- i.e. mailiana Uzenitali	4757	5
[47] DAMEOUT COMMENT OF THE STATE OF T	3096	<b>3</b>
1/-// 85/1004-0	4499	3 
[50] DEVRY [51] EDWARD HEALTH SERVICES CORP	6351	9
(ES) EINSTEIN AND NOAH RESTAURAINT	5048	3 ************************************
[52] EINSTEIN AND NOAH RESTAURT [52] FLBSFINANCIAL GROUP INC	6136	3
[54] FORT BEND COUNTY	6237 4 <b>64</b> 4	5
rssi - Garden City Hospital	5118	3
rca Coloinger System Services	4431	3
GOOD SAMARITAN HOSPILALIN	4944	3
[58] GRANT THORNTON - CHICAGO	888090	<b></b>
[58] GREENVILLEIHOSPITALISYSTEM	6219	<b>3</b>
[60] GUILFORD COUNTY, NC [61] H. LEESMOFFILT CANGER CENTER	5458	<b>,5</b>
CONTRACTOR AND	5411	5 
[62] HEARTILAND REGIONAL MEDICAL	6496	5
to de la Madical Center Inc.	4375 4887	5
IGE TINDIANA UNIVERSITY HEALTH INC	5564	3
1661 INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT	73865	<b></b>
rezu TV Technologies LC	6854	5
[68] JACKSON HEALTH SYSTEM	4843	3
[69] JACKSON:LABORATORY [70] JACKSON NATIONAL LIFE	4085	3 
	6667	
Charles and a second control of the	5354	3 ************************************
[72] Kinder Morgan Inc. [73] LEGACY HEALTH	5863 72115	5
1741 1 HC Group Inc.	5388	3
IZEL LOYOLA UNIVERSITY MEDICAL	6045	3
[76] Madison Metropolitan School	5543	3
[77] MAGELIAN HEALTH SERVICES, INC.	4769	5
178) MAINE MEDICAL CENTER 179) MARSHEELD CLINIC	2088	5
MARTIN MEMORIAL MEDICAL CENTER	73583	5 3
[80] MARTIN MEMORIAL MEDICAL [81] MAYO FOUNDATION FOR MEDICAL	4787	5
	6053 4274	
MEMORIAI HEALTHOARE SYSTEM	4761	3
TOAL MEMODIAL HERMANN HEALTHUARE	6188	<b>5</b>
[85] MERITER HOSRITALING	888070	5
[86] METHODIST HOSPITALS [87] METROHEALTH SYSTEM THE [87] METROHEALTH SYSTEM THE	4231	3
	4766	5
[88] MOSES H CONE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL [89] MUNROE REGIONAL HEALTH SYSTEM	6081	

	Name	Customer ID#	Configuration <sup>[1]</sup>
[90]	Nationwide Children's Hospital	6678	5
[91]	NEW BREED INC	6194	3
[92]	NEW YORK & PRESBYTERIAN HOSPIT	4763	3
[93]	No Description	5747	3,
[94]	No Description	562301	<b>5</b> romanos elebet <b>is de la </b>
[95]	NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS COUNCIL OF	6134	<b>.</b>
[96]	North East Independent School District	73001	3 aecodores apostánios
[97]	North Kansas CitysHospital	888085	<b>D</b>
[98]	Northbay Healthcare	2851 71947	5 ************************************
[99]	NORTHERNICOLORADO WATER CONS.	5588	5
[100]	ORLANDO HEALTH INC	6131	
[101]	Pasadena Independent School District	6681	5
[102]	PEACEHEALTH OREGON REGION	2879	3
[103]	Pharmaceutical Product Develop PREMIER HEALTH PARTNERS	6594	. 5
[104]		6198	5.7
[105] [106]	PRINCETON HEALTHCARE SYSTEM	4957	5
[107]	Racine United School District	617801	3
[108]	Rent-A-Center, Inc.	4886	3
[109]		4905	.//e= 3:
[110]	ROSEWELL PARK CANCER INSTITUTE	888012	<b>3</b> ************************************
inni	SAN/ANTONIO WATER/SYSTEM	6236	3
[112]	School District of Greenville County	6744	3 
[113]	SCHOOL DISTRICT OF HILLSBOROUG	5633	3
[114]	SCRIPPS CLINIC	5132	3 ************************************
[1/15]	Seattle: Children's Hospital Medical Ctr	6080 5260	3
[116]	SHARP HEALTHCARE - SAN DIEGO H	5260 5944	an ka a <b>in ka</b> anin ka k
[417]	SHORE HEALTH SYSTEM	6352	5
[118]	SHRINERS HOSPITAL FOR THE CHIL	6073	5
[119]	SISTERS OF MERCY HEALTH SYSTEM SOUTHWEST GENERAL HEALTH CENTE	6119	5
[120]	SPECTRUM HEALTH SYSTEM	4988	<b>(3</b>
[121]	ST. JUDE CHILDREN'S RESEARCH	5984	5
[122] [123]		888089	5
[124]	The state of the s	6232	5
[125]		71967	3.
[126]	STONY BROOK UNIV. HOSPITAL	4734	3 
[127]		4468	7
[128]	TACOMA SCHOOL DISTRICT NO.10	6444	3 Sagartin Salan
[129]	Taylor Corporation TRINITY INFORMATION SERVICES	2245	
[130]	TRINITY INFORMATION SERVICES	5999 	5 23-34-35-45-56-
	(TUCSONUNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	72149 73547	5
[132]	U.S. HEALTHWORKS, INC.	73547 2267	3
	United Supermarkets (Lic. TX)	6082	5
[134]	UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	0002	•

	Customer ID#	Configuration <sup>[1]</sup>
Name	area area establishment	ones dispetitel <b>E</b> conomic dille
r/1351 / Iniversity Of Mississippi	888090	2
[136] University of Tennessee Medical Center	4922	<b>∵</b> 
[136] University of Tennessee Medical Center [137] UNIVERSITY:OF TEXAS M.DUT MD	5424	o d
MRAIS ON WERSON STATES AND ASSESSMENT OF THE	4902	5
[138] University Of Toledo, The	6371	5
1391 UNIVERSITY PHYSICIANS HOSPTAL	6749	5
[140] USC CARE MEDICAL GROUP		raverna de la companya
1/41 VANGUARD HEALTH SYSTEMS	73648	1
THE VICTOR OF TH	6246	5
[142] VIRGINIA COMMONVEALTH - VOO	72138	3
143 VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELORING INC.	4307	5
[144] VOLUME SERVICES		miliosidas Saltinis (Austri
[144] VOLUME SERVICES	0140	Application of the second
11 - 14 Custom	5073	5
[146] Yale New Haven Health System		

### Notes and sources:

<sup>[1]</sup> Indicates the customer's configuration

<sup>[2]</sup> Note: not all customers listed had Configuration Nos. 3 or 5 for the entire data period